

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action mailed April 16, 2008. Claims 11-19 and 23-32 remain pending in the application and stand rejected. Claim 23 has been amended herein. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth below.

Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11-14, 16, 17, 19, 23-25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT Publication No. WO 01/79111 to Bright in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,537,150 to Bowers. Claims 11, 16, 18, 19, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,719,378 to Jackson, Jr. et al. in view of Bowers '150. Claim 23 is the only independent claim of these rejected groups and is directed to a method of operating a hot melt adhesive dispensing system having a controller operating a melting unit. While Applicants believe that the rejection of claim 23 is improper, claim 23 has been amended to more sharply define the invention and now recites:

wirelessly receiving information from a machine readable element regarding a hot melt adhesive to be dispensed,

the controller utilizing the received information to set a system operating condition of the hot melt adhesive dispensing system, and

operating the hot melt adhesive dispensing system according to the system operating condition to dispense the hot melt adhesive.

Support for amended claim 23 can be found in the Application with reference to page 8, lines 1-4, and page 9, lines 7-12, for example. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by the amendment to claim 23.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claim 23 because the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Bright '111 and Jackson '378 each fail to disclose wirelessly receiving information from a machine readable element regarding a hot melt adhesive to be dispensed, a controller utilizing the received information to set a system operating condition, and operating the hot melt adhesive dispensing system according to the system operating condition to dispense the hot melt adhesive, as set forth in claim 23. The Examiner admits that Bright '111 and Jackson '378 both do not teach wirelessly receiving information from a machine readable element (see Office Action at pages 3 and 4). Rather, both Bright '111 and Jackson '378 only disclose manual input of system conditions. The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Bright '111 and Jackson '378 to include bar codes as disclosed in Bowers '150, instead of manually inputting process parameters. While Applicants do not admit that the combination is proper, even if Bright '111 and Jackson '378 were modified as alleged by the Examiner, the alleged modification fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 23. Specifically, claim 23 states that the wirelessly received information is related to the hot melt adhesive, not a system condition, as alleged in the Detailed Action. It is the controller that utilizes the received information related to the hot melt adhesive to set the system operating condition, whereafter the hot melt adhesive dispensing system is operated according to the set system operating condition to dispense hot melt adhesive. Therefore, even if bar codes

were used to provide information to an adhesive dispensing system in place of manually inputting the information, as alleged by the Examiner, the references fail to disclose a controller that utilizes information about the hot melt adhesive to set a system operating condition for operating the dispensing system.

Applicants emphasize that Bowers '150 only discloses transmitting information about previously collected milk and storing that information in a database. The information is not used by a controller to set a system operating condition. Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Bowers '150, or any of the cited references, to use information about a hot melt adhesive to set a system operating condition and/or to operate the system based on that condition.

Moreover, the Examiner does not address Applicants' remarks presented in the Amendment filed January 21, 2008, regarding the allegedly wirelessly received information in Bright '111. As discussed in the January 21 Amendment, the information referred to by the Examiner (the height of adhesive in the tank, the color of the adhesive, the temperature or viscosity of the adhesive)(see Office Action at page 2, item 2) are parameters that are measured by sensors to indicate the current state of the adhesive. While these parameters may be compared with predetermined values, Bright '111 does not indicate that the predetermined values are set other than by conventional manual methods. Bright '111 therefore does not disclose utilizing wirelessly received information about the hot melt adhesive to set a system condition of an adhesive dispensing system, as set forth in claim 23.

Furthermore, the art of adhesive dispensing and dairy farming or dairy milking are such diverse arts that persons of ordinary skill in the art of adhesive dispensing

would not look to dairy farming or dairy milking to solve the problem addressed by claim 23. Therefore, neither Bright '111 nor Jackson '378 are properly combinable with Bowers '150.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness and Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 23 over Bright '111 or Jackson '378 in view of Bowers '150 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-14, 16-19, 24, 25, and 27 each depend from independent claim 23 and are therefore in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims also be withdrawn.

Claims 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Jackson '378 and Bowers '150, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,012,530 to Droz. Claims 28-32 each depend from independent claim 23 and therefore include each and every feature recited in independent claim 23. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 28-32 because the combination of Jackson '378 and Bowers '150 fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 23, as discussed above, and Droz '530 fails to cure these deficiencies. Specifically, Droz '530 is directed to an electronic label and does not disclose utilizing information wirelessly received from a machine readable element to set a system operating condition of a hot melt adhesive dispensing system, and operating the hot melt adhesive dispensing system according to the system operating condition. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 28-32 also be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

As noted in the Office Action dated April 16, 2008, the Detailed Action fails to recite specific substantive rejections of claims 15 and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable indication of allowance of claims 15 and 26.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants do not believe that any fee is due in connection with this submission. However, if any fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: /David W. Dorton/

David W. Dorton, Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)